

Program Prioritization Academic Task Force “AcTF” December 2013 Faculty Senate Progress Report

Further Program Prioritization Process Refinements

Since the last Faculty Senate meeting AcTF has been focused on discussing and developing responses to faculty concerns about the quintile system and AcTF member conflicts of interest in discussing templates.

Abandoning the quintile system. The quintile system by definition is based on two principles: 1) programs are ranked from “top” to “bottom” and b) each rank must be populated by 20% (equal distribution of 100% over the five ranks. Based on feedback and our own deliberations we have rejected these principles. We are no longer ranking programs, instead we are making judgments about which category programs best fit into based on judging the programs relative to one another. We are no longer using a system that requires an equal % of programs be placed in each category. Instead we have adopted a principle that requires an equal minimum of 15% be placed in each category to aid in making important distinctions between the programs and this system allows for 25% of programs to be distributed freely based upon the emphases that AcTF members believe need to be made feedback about UAA’s programs. A full discussion of the ranking / sorting options that we explored is on our AcTF blog. We also developed labels for each of the categories and concise and clear definitions for each of them. Although there is some resemblance to the original ranking names, the categories are re-conceptualized and have somewhat different meanings from the ranks that were originally proposed.

Conflict of Interest. The conflict of interest / recusal issue was discussed at three meetings and only resolved today (December 6th). The discussion centered on the complexity of defining conflict of interest and how to manage it. In brief, the complexities arise from a) the fact that as long as there is some required minimum distribution of programs into categories, all decisions are interrelated, thus discussing and voting on programs an AcTF member is not directly contributing to may nonetheless impact the probability of his or her program being placed there; b) academic programs are very interconnected making it less clear how conflict of interest should be defined. (for example, if one academic program provides a lot of GERs to another program, the internal demand generated that second program is essential to the justification for the continued funding of the first); c) programs may be in direct competition with one another, thus discussing the merits (or lack thereof) of a competing program may be seen as a conflict of interest for an AcTF member who is in a competing program. After weeks of careful and at times contentious deliberations the AcTF agreed upon a conflict of interest policy that will be published today.

Training and Support

Trainings in November and December. Initially the AcTF planned to have trainings in November, but due to delays in the release of the data for templates and in the finalization of the online template interface software we postponed those trainings. We released a schedule of trainings that began December 2nd and will continue to December 13th. We encourage faculty to attend these trainings to aid them in understanding the template process and to get assistance from AcTF in completing their templates. Despite challenges with the data that was released these trainings are still of value for a variety of reasons. The AcTF is committed to providing a great deal of trainings and brow bag type workshops in the spring semester.

Rubric refinement and communication. The AcTF has been discussing and refining a rubric to accompany the template and help guide our categorization efforts since October. In November we settled on a final version of the rubric and are prepared to provide it to program faculty to aid them in understanding who we will view template submissions in relation to each of the ten criteria on the template. In addition to being discussed at trainings the rubric will be distributed to the faculty at large in the near future.

Challenges

Data from Facilitation Team. The AcTF Leadership has worked with the leadership from the Facilitation Team to encourage timely release of the data and to ensure that the data to be provided with the templates would be reliable, accurate, and presented in a way that would be readily understood by faculty completing the template. Frankly we are very disappointed in the repeated data delays and now with the apparent quality of the data that have been provided to the faculty on December 5th. We have communicated this frustration with the delays and now with the quality of the data. We reject the data as now presented and have resolved to demand the administration seek other means to provide the data to the faculty.

AcTF Workload in Spring Semester 2014. The repeated delays in the delivery of data and the unknown delivery date of usable data (and therefore completed templates to the AcTF) has adversely impacted our workflow planning. It is now apparent that we cannot manage the workload of categorizing all templates by the end of spring semester (May 9th 2014). We are now in the process of adjusting our planning.

AcTF Response to Faculty Senate President's Request

The faculty senate President asked the AcTF to respond to the ongoing problems with the provision of the data for the academic templates by sending a resolution. The following is the resolution they created 12/6/2013:

The difficulties in obtaining accurate program data and the recent state budget news has demonstrated the vital need for consistent and reliable data on programs' budgets, staffing and performance as well as the program prioritization process. We are fully committed to following through on the program prioritization process for UAA by June 30, 2014. We are very grateful for the work that our colleagues have already invested in completing their program templates. In order for us to complete this work in a quality and timely fashion, we have resolved the following:

The AcTF requires that resources be put towards gathering reliable data in a timely manner managed by a subcommittee of the AcTF.

The AcTF requests that the Facilitation Team remove general faculty/staff access to the current flawed data site.

The AcTF suspends the current template submission deadlines.

Projected Milestones in January

Data and Template Submission Due Dates. Based on the AcTF resolution demanding a new approach to the provision of data to faculty we anticipate delivery of accurate and usable data in the first half of the spring semester. We are suspending the deadlines for academic template submissions until the delivery of usable data allows us to plan accordingly.

Continued training and support. The AcTF will continue to offer trainings and support and will revise these offerings to improve them as we get feedback from faculty and from the facilitation team.

Attachments:

Conflict of Interest Policy

Category Definitions

Rubric

AcTF Conflict of Interest Policy

A **Conflict of Interests** (COI) is a clash between an AcTF member's concern for addressing the objectives of prioritization with an institutional perspective and that member's private interests or allegiances. Our general guideline is to avoid COI *and the appearance of COI* in all of our activities, such that a reasonable person with knowledge of the relevant facts would not question the impartiality of individual members or of the AcTF as a whole in the matters before us.

However, as there is a minimum forced distribution of programs to all categories, common recusal practices are ineffectual for addressing COI for program prioritization.

Therefore, the AcTF has adopted several practices to minimize COI during our evaluation activities that are listed below:

- All voting will be done electronically and anonymously. This will help prevent peer pressure from influencing votes on other members' program(s).
- We will limit our review of each program to the data and narratives that were submitted.
- Discussion of programs will be limited. Whenever 80% agreement is reached through anonymous voting, there is no further discussion of that program.
- There will be no advocacy for any program; instead, each program narrative and template will stand on its own and be compared on an equivalent basis with every other program narrative and template.
- Each AcTF member will identify to the AcTF as a whole any potential COI that may exist between him or her and a particular program. If the AcTF agrees that there is a COI or an appearance of COI, the AcTF will add it to the list of programs whose categorizations the AcTF will review for bias.
- The AcTF will review all programs identified above after initial and final categorizations have been made to verify that COI did not influence the categorizations. These analyses will be part of the AcTF's final report.

Category Descriptions

Further Review – Programs in this category generally demonstrate that they are less well-aligned with established institutional priorities and community needs than other UAA academic programs. Programs in this category demonstrate less efficient and/or effective use of institutional resources than other UAA academic programs. For programs in this category, it is not clear to the AcTF that these programs’ alignment and use of resources would improve as much from increased resources as those in other categories. Further review is necessary to determine how best to address these academic programs.

Transform – Programs in this category generally demonstrate that they are less well aligned with established institutional priorities and community needs than other UAA academic programs. For programs in this category, it appears to the AcTF that unlike programs in “Further Review,” increased resources would improve the programs’ alignment. Transformation (revision, change, adaptation) of approaches and/or structure is necessary to improve alignment or effective resource use for these academic programs. Transformation may require initial investment of resources to accomplish.

Maintain – Programs in this category generally demonstrate that they are well aligned with established institutional priorities and community needs relative to other UAA academic programs. Programs in this category are making sufficient use of their current resources as demonstrated by contributions in teaching, service, and research and creative activity (if appropriate) for the relevant field. For programs in this category, it appears to the AcTF that, although these programs are necessary to UAA’s mission and making good use of available resources, increased resources beyond annual cost increases would not improve the program’s quality, productivity, depth, and/or breadth as much as programs in the Consider for Enhancement and Priority for Enhancement categories.

Consider for Enhancement - Programs in this category generally demonstrate that they are well aligned with established institutional priorities and community needs relative to other UAA academic programs. Programs in this category are making efficient and effective use of their current resources as demonstrated by contributions in teaching, service, and research and creative activity (if appropriate) for the relevant field. Programs in this category appear to the AcTF ready to improve their programs’ quality, productivity, depth, and/or breadth with increased resources and that UAA is missing the opportunity to develop without such enhancement.

Priority for Enhancement - Programs in this category generally demonstrate that they are the most well aligned with established institutional priorities and community needs relative to other UAA academic programs. Programs in this category are making efficient and effective use of their current resources as demonstrated by contributions in teaching, service, and research and creative activity (if appropriate) for the relevant field. Programs in this category appear to the AcTF to be particularly well-positioned to improve their programs’ quality, productivity, depth, and/or breadth with increased resources and that UAA is missing the opportunity to excel without such enhancement.

Rubric (embedded in template)

History & Development

Weight: 5%; 200 Words

This criterion focuses on providing a brief overview that includes historical background/factors as well as connection to the UAA Mission. UAA Priorities will be addressed under "Impact & Essentiality" and future potential will be address under "Opportunity Analysis."

1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><input type="checkbox"/> Date of implementation: "Pre-Banner" or year in Banner<input type="checkbox"/> Date of curriculum revisions<input type="checkbox"/> Date of hires for current faculty

2.	Describe why your program exists as it does at UAA. Please do not attempt to include a full history of the program. The context and how your program has corresponded to the UAA mission are desired.

Stronger	Satisfactory	Weaker
Purpose was and remains relevant and well-connected to UAA mission.	Purpose was historically important but less relevant to mission now.	Purpose was never clearly connected to UAA mission.

External Demand

Weight: 15%; 500 Words

This criterion is intended to assess demand for the program from stakeholders and entities outside UAA. This includes prospective students, employers and members of the community at large. This criterion also gives programs the opportunity to identify their external stakeholders.

1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Federal or state designation as a “high demand” degree or certificate program OR Federal or state designation as a critical field for research <input type="checkbox"/> Number of declared majors and pre-majors (if applicable)
----	--

2.	<p>Describe demand at the local, state, and/or national levels for the program’s expertise. For academic programs, you may use, for example, students’ prospective employment prospects as indicated by National Bureau of Labor statistics, Alaska Department of Labor statistics, or other data; or comment on contribution to an educated citizenry. Describe steps taken or any unique ways to better meet demand. Please acknowledge other programs in the state that address similar external demand and comment on your program’s unique contribution.</p> <p>And, if applicable, for research/creative activity and related programs, please comment on demands for workshops, presentations and other research/creative activity products. Describe steps taken or any unique ways to better meet demand.</p> <p>Verifiable data are encouraged.</p>
----	---

Stronger	Satisfactory	Weaker
Demand for program expertise outside UAA is strong and sustained, as demonstrated by multiple points of specific evidence	Demand for program expertise outside UAA is moderate, as demonstrated by some points of evidence.	Demand for program expertise outside UAA is very limited as demonstrated by few points of specific evidence

Internal Demand

Weight: 15%; 500 Words

This criterion describes the importance of this program to other academic programs and support functions. If your program has a mission to provide primarily external functions, please indicate this.

1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Which of these courses are GERs and how many students take these courses? <input type="checkbox"/> Which of these courses are required for another program and how many students take these required courses? <input type="checkbox"/> How many students take these courses for other reasons (not for a GER, major, minor, or a requirement in another degree)? <input type="checkbox"/> Do any of these courses fulfill accreditation requirements for other programs? (Specify which program(s))
----	---

2.	Describe the importance of teaching, research, creative activity, and service from this program's faculty to other academic programs and support functions. Note this includes only activities that require your program's expertise.
----	---

Stronger	Satisfactory	Weaker
Demand for program expertise within UAA is strong and broad, as demonstrated by multiple points of specific evidence	Demand for program expertise within UAA is moderate or narrow, as demonstrated by some points of evidence	Demand for program expertise within UAA is very limited as demonstrated by few points of specific evidence

Quality of Program Inputs

Weight: 10%; 300 Words

This criterion allows the program to present the quality of its inputs. Any shortcoming and needs in terms of program inputs should be addressed in Size, Scope & Productivity or Opportunity Analysis.

1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Total number of full-time faculty members <input type="checkbox"/> Total number of term faculty members at each rank <input type="checkbox"/> Total number of tenure-track faculty members at each rank <input type="checkbox"/> Total number of tenured faculty members at each rank <input type="checkbox"/> What percentage of the program do tenured or tenure-track faculty members deliver? <input type="checkbox"/> What percentage of the program do term faculty members deliver? <input type="checkbox"/> What percentage of the program does adjunct faculty deliver? <input type="checkbox"/> Does the program have external accreditation? If no, check appropriate box: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Not available <input type="checkbox"/> Program not qualified for available accreditation <input type="checkbox"/> Other:

2.	<p>Summarize the quality and role of all faculty and professional staff (exclusive of administrators) in your program. How do they help the program succeed? What specific expertise do they bring to the program? Is the percentage of the program delivered by tenured, term, and adjunct faculty at an appropriate level? Please explain why or why not.</p>

Stronger	Satisfactory	Weaker
<p>Program uses primarily personnel with appropriate skills and experience. Use of fulltime and non-fulltime faculty is well justified.</p>	<p>Program uses personnel with appropriate skills. Justification for under- or over-utilization of non-full-time faculty and less qualified staff is adequate.</p>	<p>Program uses personnel with insufficient skills and experience and provides insufficient justification.</p>

Outcomes Quality

Weight: 15%; 500 Words

This criterion allows the program to highlight its success in achieving its goals.

Question 1:

- If this is a program that leads to completion of a degree or certificate, please address part IA.
- If this is a GER program, please address part IB.
- If this is a developmental, professional development, or community education program, please address part IC.
- If this is a Research Program or a Center or Institute without a teaching mission, only answer question 2.

Question 2:

All programs with research and creative activity and program/disciplinary service contributions should answer this question.

1.	<p>IA. Describe the quality of learning for students completing this program. Following are possible guiding questions; adapt as best fits your program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><input type="checkbox"/> What is the students' readiness/mastery upon program completion?<input type="checkbox"/> What percentage of students is accepted into next-stage academic program, if applicable?<input type="checkbox"/> List external recognitions of student work (e.g., showcased papers, awards, and internships).<input type="checkbox"/> What percentage of graduates meets external standards (e.g. boards, acceptance to grad school, national exams)?<input type="checkbox"/> What do the results of the program's student learning outcomes assessment indicate? <p>IB. GER Programs: please address how the department/program measures the quality of the GER and provide evidence of outcomes quality.</p> <p>IC. Developmental, professional development, and community education programs: Please address how program measures quality of student progress toward program goals and provide evidence of outcomes quality.</p>
----	---

2.	<p>Demonstrate the quality of faculty and/or staff work from this program at the local/regional/national/international levels. Describe how your evidence demonstrates quality within the context of your program/discipline. Possible examples include creative/research/service endeavors that received community, disciplinary, or other forms of recognition or demonstrated impact (e.g., peer-reviewed journals, Kennedy Center performances, grants, publications, competitive awards, presentations, performances, Fulbright grants, how research is used or applied by clients or others, community boards).</p>
----	---

Stronger	Satisfactory	Weaker
Outcomes of high quality as demonstrated by multiple, varied, AND specific sources of evidence.	Outcomes of moderate quality as demonstrated by multiple, varied AND/OR specific sources of evidence.	Outcomes of limited quality as demonstrated by few, vague, or repetitive sources of evidence.

Size, Scope, and Productivity

Weight: 5%; 200 Words

This criterion addresses the relative size of the program in terms of credit-hour production, number of students successfully served, as well as teaching, research, creative activity, and service contributions produced by the program.

1.	<p>Total Faculty FTE: SCH production by year: Number of graduates OR number of course completers: Percentage of capacity unfilled (below course capacity): Other applicable size metric: (e.g. number of publications, performances, grants, client reports, trainings, contracts, etc.)</p>

2.	<p>Given the numbers above, comment on how productive your program is in terms of teaching, research/creative activity, and service that draws on programmatic expertise. Are there any unique features of this program that would assist in explaining its productivity?</p>

Stronger	Satisfactory	Weaker
Evidence provided demonstrates high productivity relative to size and scope.	Evidence provided demonstrates moderate productivity relative to size and scope.	Evidence provided demonstrates limited productivity relative to size and scope.

Revenue and other resources generated

Weight: 5%; 200 Words

This criterion focuses on the revenues that are attributable to the program's efforts. Directions: Provide details on efforts to increase revenue from tuition and fees and how this has impacted the operation of the program. Explain efforts to obtain external funding (other than tuition and fees) and how these efforts impacted the operation of the program (i.e., were the efforts successful). If no efforts have been made to increase revenue through tuition, fees, or external funding, or if those efforts were not successful, explain why.

1.	<p>Non-teaching programs leave question 1 blank.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Total Tuition (use number of student credit hours times tuition cost; tuition waivers are not subtracted) <input type="checkbox"/> Lab, course, and program related fees <input type="checkbox"/> How many SCH were in-state? Out-of-state? <input type="checkbox"/> % of department and college tuition revenue produced by this program
----	--

2.	<p>List how much money the program secured/maintained in external funding?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Gifts and donations (including alumni support); donations for scholarships <input type="checkbox"/> Equipment donations <input type="checkbox"/> Contracts and grants <input type="checkbox"/> Fundraising <input type="checkbox"/> Legislative direct (such as line items to support certain programs) <input type="checkbox"/> Statewide direct (such as line items to support certain programs) <input type="checkbox"/> Other external subsidies <input type="checkbox"/> Indirect cost recovery <input type="checkbox"/> Endowed chair <input type="checkbox"/> Other endowments <input type="checkbox"/> Performance revenue (PBAC)
----	---

3.	Provide any context, explanation or interpretation relevant to understanding the above data.
----	--

Stronger	Satisfactory	Weaker
Sources and amounts of revenue are well aligned with the quality of inputs and outcomes.	Sources and amounts of revenue are moderately aligned with quality of inputs and outcomes.	Sources and amounts of revenue are not aligned to program goals.

Costs and Other Expenses

Weight: 5%; 200 Words

This criterion focuses on the expenses (including assigned overhead) incurred by the program in conducting its activities.

1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☐ Instructional costs per SCH, calculated: $\text{Instructional cost per FTES} = \frac{\text{Instructional Salaries}}{\text{Total FTES}}$ ☐ Total budget allocations for programmatic equipment, materials, or facilities (including rent)

2.	<p>Please describe how you have created efficiencies and managed costs and quality within your program (as applicable). Please comment on the costs above as appropriate.</p>

Stronger	Satisfactory	Weaker
Strong and usually successful attempts to manage costs without sacrificing quality. Costs are in line with value and UAA mission.	Strong attempts to manage costs without sacrificing quality. Costs are moderately in line with value and UAA mission.	No evidence of attempts to manage costs. Costs are not in line with value and UAA mission.

Impact and Essentiality

Weight: 20%; 700 Words

This criterion measures alignment with UAA’s strategic vision and mission. Impact measures effectiveness in supporting the mission and strategic vision.

Impact and essentiality that is historic should be noted in the “History” section of the template. Impact and essentiality that is expected in the future should be noted in the “Opportunity Analysis” section.

1.	<p>Non-teaching programs leave question 1 blank.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Diversity of graduates or completers <input type="checkbox"/> Percentage of graduates or completers who were Alaska residents <input type="checkbox"/> Percentage of total UAA graduates who took any courses from this program

2.	<p>Below are the priorities from the UAA Strategic Plan 2017. Provide evidence that illustrates how this program makes significant contributions to at least two (2) and no more than three (3) of the strategic plan priorities, listed below.</p>

Stronger	Satisfactory	Weaker
Strong evidence of significant contributions to two or three of UAA’s priorities.	Adequate evidence of significant contributions to two of UAA’s priorities.	Weak evidence contributions to UAA’s priorities.

1. Priority A: Strengthen the total UAA instructional program: sustain and develop courses and programs to address the opportunities and challenges of Alaskan life; prepare students to think and work in a rapidly changing world; and increase active student participation in research, creative expression, and service learning.
2. Priority B: Reinforce and rapidly expand UAA’s research mission: strengthen capacity for competitive sponsored research, and give special attention to Alaska, the Pacific Rim, and the circumpolar North.
3. Priority C: Expand educational opportunity and increase student success: improve transition to higher education with an emphasis on serving Alaska Natives, other underrepresented populations, and first-generation college students; continue to improve the rates at which students attain their educational goals; and substantially increase the number of our students who achieve the highest academic distinction.
4. Priority D: Strengthen the UAA community: develop campus life and the total college experience; build and maintain our facilities as sustainable models for northern universities; and recruit, retain, and develop the highest quality faculty and staff.

5. Priority E: Expand and enhance the Public Square: expand our commitment to community engagement, become a national model for community partnerships, and make our campuses the venue of choice for Alaskan public life.

Opportunity Analysis

Weight: 5%; 200 Words

This criterion gives each program the opportunity to share its own vision for how it could align more effectively with the mission of UAA and what resources or opportunities would allow that to happen. This criterion is meant to encourage innovative suggestions that have not previously been considered by the institution.

1.	Given current resources, what do the next 3-5 years look like for your program? If desired, what new opportunities could you exploit by restructuring and/or realigning existing resources?

2.	Of the following, which would be your greatest priority for increased funding? (choose one): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Increase volume of outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> Increase quality of outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> Increase breadth of outcomes <p>Please Explain:</p>

Stronger	Satisfactory	Weaker
Realistic plan to make significant contributions with new resources.	Realistic plan to make contributions with new resources.	Vague plan unlikely to make contributions with new resources.